



SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APP	LICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
Ø8/255,2°	77 06/08	/94 SOMBROEK			PHN14491
		24M1/0619	\neg	BRIER, EX	AMINER
CORPORATE PATENT COUNSEL U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	E PLAINS RI N, NY 1059:			2415 DATE MAILED:	10
					Ø6/19/96

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents

Advisory Action

Application No.

Applicant(s)

08/255,277

Sombroek et al

Examiner

Jeffery A. Brier

Group Art Unit 2415



THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)] a) [X] expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
a) NT aurieur 2 mentho from the mailing date of the final rejection	ļ
-	ļ
b) expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.	ļ
Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.	
Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).	,
Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on $\underline{May\ 30,\ 1996}$ has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:	
★ The proposed amendment(s):	
🛛 will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.	
they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).	
they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).	
 they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. 	
they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE:	
Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):	
Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):	
Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):	
Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):	
Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.	
 Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. ☑ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in conditi for allowance because: 	ion
 Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. ✓ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in conditi for allowance because: The Kato reference meets the limitations of proposed claim 1 because the argued system software in Kato is a part of the system. 	ion
 Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. ✓ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in conditi for allowance because: The Kato reference meets the limitations of proposed claim 1 because the argued system software in Kato is a part of the user interface. 	ion o <u>f</u>
 Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. ✓ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in conditi for allowance because: The Kato reference meets the limitations of proposed claim 1 because the argued system software in Kato is a part of the system. 	ion o <u>f</u>
 Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. ☑ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Kato reference meets the limitations of proposed claim 1 because the argued system software in Kato is a part of the user interface. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised. 	ion o <u>f</u>
 Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. ✓ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in conditi for allowance because: The Kato reference meets the limitations of proposed claim 1 because the argued system software in Kato is a part of the user interface. ✓ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ion o <u>f</u>
 Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. ☑ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Kato reference meets the limitations of proposed claim 1 because the argued system software in Kato is a part of the user interface. □ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised the Examiner in the final rejection. ☑ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):	ion o <u>f</u>
 Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. ☑ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Kato reference meets the limitations of proposed claim 1 because the argued system software in Kato is a part of the user interface. □ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised the Examiner in the final rejection. ☑ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: NONE 	ion o <u>f</u>
 Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. ☑ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Kato reference meets the limitations of proposed claim 1 because the argued system software in Kato is a part of the user interface. □ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised the Examiner in the final rejection. ☑ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):	ion of by
 Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. ✓ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition allowance because: The Kato reference meets the limitations of proposed claim 1 because the argued system software in Kato is a part of the user interface. ✓ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised the Examiner in the final rejection. ✓ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: NONE Claims objected to: NONE Claims rejected: 1 and 3-11 	ion of by
 Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. ▼ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Kato reference meets the limitations of proposed claim 1 because the argued system software in Kato is a part of the user interface. ▼ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised the Examiner in the final rejection. ▼ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: NONE Claims objected to: NONE Claims rejected: 1 and 3-11 The proposed drawing correction filed on has has not been approved by the Examiner. 	ion of by